

- 43 *Kalyāṇamittatā silānaṃ āhāro, indriyasamvaro brahmacariyassa āhāro, avisaṃvādanā mittānaṃ āhāro.*
- 44 *Kulaputto yasmim gāme vā nigame vā paṭivasati, tattha ye te honti gahapati vā gahapatiputtā vā daharā vā vuddhasilino vuddhā vā vuddhasilino saddhāsampannā, silāsampannā, cāgasampannā, paññāsampannā, tehi saddhīm santitṭhati sallapati sākacchaṃ samāpajjati; yathārūpānaṃ saddhāsampannānaṃ saddhāsampadaṃ anusikkhati, yathārūpānaṃ sila-, . . . cāga-, . . . paññāsampannānaṃ paññāsampadaṃ anusikkhati.* My translation is slightly abridged. The whole Sutta is repeated at A IV 285–9 with Ujjayo the Brahmin.
- 45 1325. *Tattha katamā dovaccassatā?*
Sahadhammike vuccamāne dovaccassatāyaṃ dovaccassiyaṃ dovaccassatā vipatikūlagāhitā vipaccanikasātātā anādariyaṃ anādaratā agāravatā appaṭiṣṣavatā — ayaṃ vuccati dovaccassatā.
 1326. *Tattha katamā pāpamittatā?*
Ye te puggalā assaddhā dussilā appassutā macchārino duppaññā — yā tesam sevanā nisevanā samsevanā bhajanā sambhajanā bhatti sambhatti sampavāṇkatā — ayaṃ vuccati pāpamittatā.
 1327. *Tattha katamā sovaccassatā?*
Sahadhammike vuccamāne sovaccassatāyaṃ sovaccassiyaṃ sovaccassatā appaṭikūlagāhitā avipaccanikasātātā sagāravatā sappatiṣṣavatā — ayaṃ vuccati sovaccassatā.
 1328. *Tattha katamā kalyāṇamittatā?*
Ye te puggalā saddhā silavanto bahussutā cāgavanto paññāvanto — yā tesam sevanā nisevanā samsevanā bhajanā sambhajanā bhatti sambhatti sampavāṇkatā — ayaṃ vuccati kalyāṇamittatā.
 See also Vbh 359, 369, 371, Pp 20, 24. The translation of these synonyms or near-synonyms is necessarily slightly arbitrary. In the passage on *pāpamittatā* I have given only ‘following after’ for *sevanā*, *nisevanā* and *samsevanā*, and ‘being devoted to’ for both *bhatti* and *sambhatti*.
- 46 Nānamoli, *Path of Purification*, p. 108, *The Guide*, p. 63, *Piṭaka-Disclosure*, p. 342. B. C. Law, *Human Types* (PTS, 1924) pp. 30, 35. See also *Middle Length Sayings*, vol. I pp. 125–6, and *Book of the Discipline* vol. I (PTS, 1938) p. 310.
- 47 In Christianity, compare, for example, the discussion of friendship by John Cassian (3rd–4th century), in his sixteenth Conference, in E. Pichery (ed. and transl.) *Jean Cassien: Conférences*, vol. II pp. 221–247 (*Sources Chrétiennes*, no. 54, Paris, 1958).

THREE SOULS, ONE OR NONE: THE VAGARIES OF A PĀLI PERICOPE.

Early in that mysterious text, the *Cakkavatti-sihanāda Suttā*, is a recommendation how the ideal ruler should behave. From time to time, he is told, he is to ask advice of the best holy men available; they are characterized in three expressions (D III 61):¹ *Ye ca te tātā vijjite samaṇa-brāhmaṇā mada-ppamādā paṭiviratā khanti-soracce nivijjhā ekam attānaṃ damenti ekam attānaṃ samenti ekam attānaṃ parinibbāpenti, te kālena kālaṃ upasaṃkamitvā paripuccheyyāsi.* The first two characterizations, ‘abstaining from intoxication and carelessness and attached to patience and gentleness’ are straightforward. It is the third, from the first *ekam* to *parinibbāpenti*, which seems surprising and is the subject of this article. Though the text is famous, I am not aware that any scholar has drawn attention to what I shall from now on refer to as ‘our expression’ before.² Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids translate: ‘each mastering self, each calming self, each perfecting self’, and offer no comment. They seem to be taking each *ekam* as a nominative, presumably positing that the final *m* is a junction consonant; they translate as if it were a nominative singular, but of course with a plural verb that is impossible.

One’s first impression of the grammar — an impression which I shall show to be correct — is that *ekam* must be an accusative singular masculine qualifying *attānaṃ*. The translators evidently evaded this interpretation because it yields an odd meaning: Buddhists deny the existence of an *attan*, a self. The word can also be used as a reflexive pronoun, and one can imagine speaking of mastering and calming oneself, *attānaṃ*, but *parinibbāpenti*, a Buddhist technical term for putting out the fires of passion, hate and delusion, sits strangely with *attānaṃ*. Worse still, the sentence runs as if the repetition of *eka* could be distributive: ‘they master one self, tame one self, bring one self to *nibbāna*.’ That sounds as if people who are supposed to realize their lack of self are being credited with three.

Though the construction is not in fact distributive, it seems to have struck Buddhaghosa the same way, to judge by his comment on the passage (*Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī* III 851): *attano rāgādīnaṃ damanādīhi ekam attānaṃ damenti samenti parinibbāpentī ti vuccanti*: 'By mastering etc. their own [the self's] passion etc. they are said to . . .' As I understand this gloss, Buddhaghosa is suggesting that 'self' is mentioned thrice to correspond to the three roots of evil: passion, hate and delusion. But that is not quite how he is interpreted by the sub-commentary, which evidently finds the passage troublesome (*Dīghanikāyatthakathā-ṭīkā* III 36): *Rāgādīnaṃ ti rāgadosamohamānādīnaṃ. Damanādīhi ti damana-samananibbāpanehi. Ekam attānaṃ ti ekam cittaṃ, ekaccaṃ attano cittaṃ ti attho. Rāgādīnaṃ hi pubbabhāgiyaṃ damanādīpaccekaṃ icchitabbaṃ, na maggakkhaṇe viya ekajjhaṃ paṭisaṅkhānamukhena pajahanato. Ekam attānaṃ ti vā vivekavasena ekam ekākinaṃ attānaṃ*. 'Passion etc. means passion, hate, delusion, pride etc. Taming etc. means mastering, calming, bringing to *nibbāna*. *Ekam attānaṃ* means one thought, one particular thought of oneself. For it is desirable that passion etc. should each be mastered etc. in sequence, not by abandoning them all at once through ratiocination as happens at the moment of [entering on] the path. Or else *ekam attānaṃ* means the self when it is sole, that is alone, by virtue of [being in] solitude.'

The PTS *Pali-English Dictionary* s.v. *parinibbāpeti* leads to A II 68 and A III 46. Our expression occurs in a paragraph which is identical at these two places (though the dictionary entry implies otherwise). The wider context is different from that in the *Cakkavatti-sihanāda Sutta*, but the threefold characterization of ideal brahmins and ascetics is the same. At II 68 F. L. Woodward translates our expression: 'who tame the one self, calm the one self, cool the one self', and adds a footnote to which I return below. At III 46 E. M. Hare translates: 'each mastering self, each calming self, each perfecting self.' The commentary on this latter reference (*Manoratha-pūraṇī* III 254) just refers one back to that on the former, which reads (*Manoratha-pūraṇī* III 100): *ekam attānaṃ damentī ti ekam attano va attabhāvaṃ indriyadamenā*

damentī. samentī ti attano cittaṃ kilesavūpasamanena samentī. parinibbāpentī ti kilesaparinibbānen' eva parinibbāpentī. 'Ekam attānaṃ damenti means: they master one, that is their own, life by mastering the senses. Samenti means: they calm their own mind by laying to rest the defilements. Parinibbāpentī means: they bring to nibbāna by the complete blowing out of the defilements.' As I understand this, Woodward's translation is in accord with the commentary, though his choice of the word 'self' is not very happy,

The *Tipiṭaka Concordance*, having luckily reached the letter *p*, leads to two further occurrences of our expression: A I 168 and A IV 45. Both turn out to be interesting texts. I take the latter first. In this *sutta*, which I intend to translate in full and comment on elsewhere, the Buddha provides allegorical equivalents for the three fires of the brahminical *śrauta* ritual. Ascetics and brahmins characterized by our set of three expressions are said to be the *dakkhineyyaggi*, 'the fire worthy of offerings', which by a pun is equated with the brahminical southern fire (Sanskrit: *dakṣiṇāgni*). E. M. Hare is again the PTS translator of this passage; in a footnote he mentions the three parallel passages which we have already dealt with, and he repeats his translation of A III 46, with the insignificant change of 'taming' for 'mastering'. His footnote also refers to the commentary (*Manoratha-pūraṇī* IV 30), which is brief: *attānaṃ ti cittaṃ, damentī ti indriyadamenā damenti, rāgādisamanena samentī, tesaṇṇeva parinibbāpanena parinibbāpentī*. This adds nothing new; *attan* is explained as 'mind', but *eka* is passed over in silence.

We turn to A I 168, a *sutta* in the *Brāhmaṇa-vagga*. A brahmin called Saṅgārava says: 'Gotama, we brahmins officiate at and institute sacrifices. Whoever does either of those things acquires merit/purification consequent on the sacrifice which affects more than one body. But Gotama, a person who comes from anyone's family and goes from home to homelessness masters himself alone, calms, himself alone, brings peace to himself alone; so he acquires merit/purification consequent on his leaving home (*pabbajjā*) which affects just one body.' To this the Buddha replies that by preaching the truth which he has discovered he puts hundreds of thousands

of beings on the same path. He asks the brahmin whether the merit he has obtained thus affects one body or many. The brahmin has to agree that it affects many.

The brahmin is represented as saying that sacrifice is more efficacious than what Buddhist renouncers do because the results take effect for more than one life. It is the standard brahminical view that correct ritual performance benefits one in both this life and the next; this view seems to be even older than the doctrine of *saṃsāra*, which of course multiplied the number of lives one has. The Buddha shows that his preaching too benefits more than one life; in fact it benefits hundreds of thousands, but these lives are contemporaneous, not sequential.

(There are further points of similarity and contrast which are not directly relevant to this article. The brahmin implies that sacrifice is for brahmins only, whereas just anyone can leave the world — a state of affairs which of course the Buddha would admit but approve of. In the brahmin's speech the etymological meaning of *puñña*, 'purificatory', would be uppermost, whereas the Buddhists adapted the word so that the usual English translation, 'meritorious', is more appropriate, and fits the Buddha's reply in this text.)

In this context, our expression is intended pejoratively; it is the brahmin's criticism. Disagreeing with the criticism, the Buddha does not use the expression. Its meaning here is crystal clear. The commentary (*Manoratha-pūraṇī* II 266–7) says: *ekam attānaṃ damentī ti attano indriyadamanavasena ekam attānaṃ eva damenti*; '*ekam attānaṃ damenti* means: by virtue of mastering his own senses it is himself alone that he masters;' and it gives precisely parallel glosses on the other two phrases.

F. L. Woodward, the PTS translator of this text, also gets the point, though I have preferred my own translation. He writes: 'tames only the single self, calms only the single self, leads to Nibbāna only the single self.' He adds a note adducing the parallel passages, but we have seen that their PTS translations, even Woodward's own at A II 68, are different.

Our expression makes perfect sense in the mouth of a

brahminical critic of Buddhism but makes no sense in Buddhist terminology and is inapplicable to Buddhists. This was already evident to Woodward. In a footnote to his translation of A II 68 (*The Book of the Gradual Sayings* II 76) he points out that our expression occurs at A I 168, 'where it fits the context far better than it does here.'

The reader may feel that by leaving the correct interpretation till last I have made a mountain out of a molehill. But my purpose has been to show that not only modern scholars (E. M. Hare evidently did not read his predecessor's footnotes) but also ancient ones have gone badly astray. The commentaries on the passages in which our expression occurs have merely taken over from the comment on A I 168 the (banal and uncontroversial) glosses on the verbs. Those which gloss *attānaṃ*, the self, as *cittaṃ*, the mind, have lost sight of the original point. None of them has known what to do with the difficulties created by the transfer of our expression from a pejorative to a eulogistic context, so that they have virtually ignored *ekam*. The *Dīgha* sub-commentary has seen the difficulty and tried to solve it, but with little success.

For the problem lies deeper: our expression simply cannot be made to fit a eulogistic context. It has long been known that the texts of the Pali Canon have been built up out of what biblical scholarship has dubbed pericopes, passages of scripture which were standardized and used as units to compose longer texts. This is another piece of evidence in that direction, small but I think not insignificant. The pericope which I have been calling 'our expression' was clumsily used, so that I think we can trace the line of development. It started at A I 168. Then, I submit, it was transferred to A IV 45, a very similar context, in which the Buddha is putting down a brahmin critic by turning his terms back on him. Once one knows I 168, one sees that the passage at IV 45 means: 'These renouncers, whom *you* declare to control (and benefit) themselves alone, are in fact worthy of gifts, worthier than your sacrificial fire.' But that meaning cannot be deduced from the text read in isolation, as it now stands.

The final stage was that the whole threefold characterization of ideal holy men was borrowed from A IV 45 by the other texts cited. I would surmise that the two A passages took it first and the *Cakkavatti-sihanāda Sutta* last of all, because that is a much longer text, which like much of the *Dīgha Nikāya* has been built up by combining several pericopes.

I hope to have shown that this process of composition was sometimes done in a rather automatic way: in this case, at least, the results can no longer be plausibly claimed to reflect the Buddha's own terminology. I hope also to have shown that how the Buddha argued with brahmins can be relevant to understanding some aspects, including verbal details, of his teaching. This latter theme I intend to explore in future publications.

OXFORD

Richard Gombrich

Notes

¹ All references are to PTS publications.

² A. K. Warder, in his *Introduction to Pali*, p. 131, uses this as a passage for reading but omits our expression, so he must have seen it as problematic.

MINOR PĀLI GRAMMAR TEXTS: THE SADDABINDU AND ITS 'NEW' SUBCOMMENTARY

Introduction

The epilegomena to volume I of the Critical Pāli Dictionary¹ give a list of 'fourteen minor texts' on Pāli grammar with a considerable number of exegetical works (see CPD Epilegomena 5.4.1–14)². Most of these texts and their auxiliary literature were written in Burma between the 11th and the 19th century A.D.³ The name 'minor grammar texts' (*saddā-nay-kyam*³) is found in the *Piṭaka-to²-samuiṇ*³, a 19th century bibliography of the manuscripts kept in the Royal library at Mandalay.⁴ It clearly refers to the size of the texts, which ranges from 20 to 568 verses, and is used in contrast to the 'major grammar texts' (*saddā-kri*³) written by Kaccāyana, Moggallāna, and Aggavaṃsa.⁵

The list in *Piṭ-sm* is not limited to the fourteen texts given as a group in the CPD. This limitation was apparently just a publisher's choice when the texts were first printed in Burma.⁶ However, we also find anthologies of '16 minor grammar texts' published in Burma in 1937, and '15 minor grammar texts' published in 1954.⁷

These minor Pāli grammar texts are hardly known outside Burma and have never been edited in Roman script.⁸ Therefore I venture to present an edition of the shortest text here, along with a subcommentary. It is the *Saddabindu* ('the drop of grammar') compiled by King Kya-cvā of the Pagan dynasty (1234–50 A.D.) for the use of the ladies in the royal palace.⁹ It gives a mere glimpse of the traditional subjects in Kaccāyana's grammar: euphony (*sandhi*), nouns (*nāma*), case (*kāraka*), compounds (*samāsa*), noun derivatives (*tad-dhita*), verbs (*ākhyāta*), and radical suffixes (*kita*) are dealt with in 1–4 verses each.

The subcommentary apparently entitled *Ganthesāro nāma Saddabinduviniṇṇayo* (the investigation of the *Saddabindu* (text) called 'Essence of Book(s)')¹⁰ was written by Sad-